

Remarks/Arguments

In response to the Office Action mailed December 29, 2003, Applicant submits this Amendment concurrently with a Petition for a One-Month Extension of Time. A complete listing of all pending claims is submitted herewith.

In the Office Action, the abstract and the specification were objected to for formalities. Claims 1-6 and 10-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,286,003 to Muta (the “Muta” patent). Claims 7-8 were rejected as being obvious over Muta in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,401,118 to Thomas (the “Thomas” patent). Claim 9 was rejected as being obvious over Muta in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,011,918 to Cohen et al. (the “Cohen” patent). By this amendment, the abstract, the specification, claims 1 and 10 have been amended. No new matter has been added by the amendments.

For reasons to be set forth below, it is requested that the rejections be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed to issue.

The Specification

In the Office Action, the abstract was objected to for exceeding 150 words. The abstract has been amended. It is requested that the objection thereto be withdrawn. The specification was objected to for containing a spelling error. By this amendment, paragraph [0052] has been amended to correct this spelling error, thereby obviating the rejection with respect thereto. It is requested that the objection to the specification be withdrawn. Amendments to correct typographical errors have also been made to paragraphs [0015], [0017], [0053], [0060], and [0061]. In the interest of clarity, Applicants particularly point out that paragraph [0061] has been amended to add a comma after the phrase “non-network-aware” on the second line of the paragraph. In amended Figs. 6(a), 6(b), and 7, corrections have been made to conform the formal drawings to the informal drawings originally filed with the application. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

The Rejection under 35. U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-6 and 10-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Muta. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “providing the user interface toolkit on the remote client such that the component is configured to perform the function on the remote client, wherein said component is related to user interaction, and to generate an event coupled to said component in response to user interaction with said component.” As discussed in the specification, a “user interface toolkit” includes a component which is related to user interaction, and which generates an event *coupled to the component in response to user interaction with that component* (see, e.g., specification, paragraph [0037] and [0039].)

Muta neither discloses nor suggests this step. The Examiner analogizes the “remote controlling software” of Muta (column 2, lines 36-44) to the user interface toolkit of Applicants’ invention. (Office Action, page 3, lines 5-7.) However, the remote controlling software of Muta does not anticipate the user interface toolkit of claim 1. For example, Muta *generally* monitors events such as the operation of an input device, such as the “X” and “Y” positions of a mouse on a display. (See, Figure 17, column 9, lines 40-43.) Significantly, Muta neither discloses nor suggests that mouse movement and/or keystrokes are tied to any particular graphical component on the display, e.g., whether the mouse or keyboard actuates a graphical component, button, menu item, etc. Indeed, Muta makes no connection between any user input and any particular graphical component.

In addition, Muta neither discloses nor suggests the step of “providing a remote-capable user interface toolkit on the server by creating a remote-capable component which is configured to interact with the application according to the application programming interface and which is configured to generate a message to the component on the remote client to perform the respective function on the remote client, such that the respective function is only performed on the remote client.” The Examiner has cited Muta (column 2, line 55 – column 3, line 4) as describing this step, although it is unclear

which components of Muta the Examiner would analogize to the “remote-capable user interface toolkit.” Nevertheless, Muta does not disclose or suggest “a remote-capable user interface toolkit” as claimed in claim 1. In addition, no such “remote-capable user interface toolkit” is disclosed or suggested by Muta “to interact with the application according to the application programming interface.” In contrast, Muta discloses software on the “slave daemon 247” (e.g., the drawing command monitor 323) which “*monitors* all the APIs that are called for rewriting the GUI screen at the slave server 240 (Muta, column 11, lines 13-16, emphasis supplied.)

Moreover, claim 1 has been amended to state that such respective function is only performed on the remote client. In contrast, Muta describes that the function of generating an image is performed by the graphics engine 321 on the “slave daemon 247” rather than only on the “master applet 21”:

“[W]hen the slave daemon 247 is activated, the GUI screen of the slave server 240 is re-drawn (block 509) in FIG. 7)” (Muta, column 9, lines 49-50.)

“The GUI screen that is rewritten in response to the window message is output as an image on a physical display device 245 to a graphics engine 321 and a display driver 325 in the window system 320.” (Muta, Figure 8 and column 10, lines 64-67.)

Muta neither discloses nor suggests the step of “invoking the remote-capable user interface toolkit by the application to perform a function according to the application programming interface.” As discussed above, the Examiner has not clearly identified a “remote-capable user interface toolkit” on the server. Moreover, the software on the slave server 240 (the drawing command monitor 323) is not *invoked* by an application, but rather “*monitors* all the APIs that are called for rewriting the GUI screen at the slave server 240.” (Muta, column 11, lines 13-16, emphasis supplied.)

Muta neither discloses nor suggests the step of “generating the message by the remote-capable component of the remote-capable user interface toolkit on the server in response to the invocation by the application, the message being a command to the user interface toolkit on the remote client to perform the function.” The “window message” generated by Muta is generated after analyzing events (col. 10, lines 42-50); however,

such message is not generated “in response to the invocation by the application.” For each of the reasons discussed above, claim 1 is not believed anticipated by Muta.

Claims 2-6 depend on claim 1 and are allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Moreover, with respect to claim 6, Muta neither discloses nor suggests a step of “generating an event by the remote-capable component of the remote-capable user interface toolkit in response to the step of invoking.” The section of Muta cited by the Examiner, i.e., column 10, lines 42-50, and reference to Figure 8 indicate that the slave server 240 *monitors* events, rather than *generating* events. Moreover, Muta neither discloses nor suggests that the slave server *generates* events “in response to an invocation by the application.

Claim 10 is allowable for the same reasons discussed above for claim 1. For example, claim 10 recites “a user interface toolkit on the remote client having a component configured to perform a function on the remote client, wherein said component is related to user interaction, and to generate an event coupled to said component in response to user interaction with said component.” Muta neither discloses nor suggests such a feature. Accordingly, Claim 10 is not believed anticipated by Muta.

Claims 11-20 depend from claim 10 are allowable at least for the reasons discussed above for claim 10. It is therefore requested that the rejection of claims 1-6 and 10-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be withdrawn.

The Rejection under 35. U.S.C. §103

Claims 7-8 were rejected as being obvious under 35. U.S.C. §103 over Muta in view of Thomas.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and asserts that the claims are not obvious over Muta in view of Thomas. To render a claim obvious, the prior art must contain a suggestion to produce the claimed invention and evidence which would convey a reasonable expectation of success to the skilled artisan. *In re O'Farrell*, 853 F.2d 894, 903, 7 USPQ2d 1673, 1681 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The teaching or suggestion and the

reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Claims 7-8 depend from claims 1 and 6 and are believed allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 6. Moreover, the Examiner has not provided sufficient motivation to combine the references. The purported motivation for combining such references, as provided by the Examiner is to “improve throughput and availability.” However, Muta describes a system for generating drawing commands. In contrast, Smith describes an online monitoring search engine. Absent reliance on Applicants’ invention, the Examiner has not indicated why one skilled in the art, seeking to improve “throughput and availability” of a graphical system, would look to an online search engine for such improvement. Further, no specific teaching in either cited reference, which would support the resulting improvements, are referenced by the Examiner in the Office Action. Accordingly, claims 7-8 are believed non-obvious over the combined references. It is requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 9 was rejected as being obvious over Muta in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,011,918 to Cohen et al. (the “Cohen” patent).


Claim 9 has been amended for clarity only, and not for reasons related to patentability. Amended claim 9 depends from claims 1 and is believed allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1. Moreover, Muta and/or Cohen, either alone or in combination neither disclose nor suggest the step of “substituting the portion of the code relevant to executing the function with the portion of code configured to issue the remote command to execute the function.” Accordingly, claim 9 is believed non-obvious over the combined references. It is requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Claims 1-20 are believed allowable, and this application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Prompt and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 29, 2004

By 
Walter M. Egbert, III
Patent Office Reg. No. 37,317

Attorney for Applicants
BAKER BOTTS, L.L.P.
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112
(212) 408-2561